

Please note, these transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

COMMITTEE MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
DIVERSION, PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING
1001 I STREET
2ND FLOOR
SIERRA HEARING ROOM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 2003
9:00 A.M.

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS

Steven R. Jones, Chairperson

Jose Medina

Linda Moulton-Patterson

Cheryl Peace

STAFF

Mark Leary, Executive Director

Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Gennine Bakulich, Secretary

Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Tricia Broddrick, Assistant Director

Pat Schiavo, Deputy Director

Zane Poulson

Cara Morgan

Chris Schmidle

Steve Sorelle

Lorene Van Kekerix

Melissa Vargas

ALSO PRESENT

Evan Edgar, California Refuse Removal Council

Jim Hemminger, Rural Counties Environmental Services

Frank Oviedo, City of Elk Grove

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

	Page
Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum	1
A. Deputy Director's Report	33
B. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For Unincorporated San Diego County -- (May Board Item 20)	5
Motion	6
Vote	6
C. Consideration Of The Amended Household Hazardous Waste Element For Unincorporated San Diego County -- (May Board Item 21)	6
Motion	7
Vote	7
D. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For Unincorporated Riverside County -- (May Board Item 22)	7
Motion	8
Vote	8
E. Consideration Of A Request To Extend The Due Date For Submittal Of The Source Reduction And Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element, And Nondisposal Facility Element By the City Of Rancho Santa Margarita, Orange County -- (May Board Item 23)	8
Motion	11
Vote	12
F. Consideration Of A Request To Extend The Due Date For Submittal Of The Source Reduction And Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element, And Nondisposal Facility Element By The City Of Elk Grove, Sacramento County -- (May Board Item 24)	12
Motion	15
Vote	15

INDEX CONTINUED

	Page
G. Status Update On The Venues And Special Events Waste Reduction Project -- (May Board Item 25)	15
H. Consideration Of The Grant Awards For The Unified Education Strategy Grant Program For Cycle One FY 2002/2003 And FY 2003/2004 And For Cycle Two FY 2002/2003 And FY 2003/2004 -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item K And May Board Item 26)	27
Motion	32
Vote	33
I. Discussion Of Historical Progress And Current Achievement Of Diversion Goals And Request For Direction Regarding Future Program Implementation Efforts -- (May Board Item 27)	33

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning and welcome to the Wednesday, May 7th, meeting of the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Committee.

For those of you that want to speak on an item, there's speaker slips in the back of the room. Go ahead and fill it out, give it to Ms. Bakulich up here. She'll give it to me, and we'll let you talk.

If you have pagers or cell phones, could you please put them on vibrate or shut them off during this meeting, so we don't get interrupted.

And with that, would you call the roll.

SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Here.

SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.

SECRETARY BAKULICH: Peace?

BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Here.

SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Here.

Thank you.

Mr. Medina had some issues that came up that he informed us late yesterday that he had to take care of.

Our Chair, Linda Moulton-Patterson, had to go to Assembly Subcommittee on our budget, but was able to get

1 here on time. We appreciate all the hard work she's been
2 going through, trying to get through this maze of budget
3 hearings and the attacks on this Board. And we do all
4 appreciate that work, because it has been tough duty.

5 I want to ask for ex partes. Ms. Peace?

6 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: My ex partes are up to date.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Committee member
8 Moulton-Patterson?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm up to
10 date.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And I had a conversation with
12 John Cupps about the incredible presentation that
13 Mr. Schiavo and Cara are going to put on today.

14 And that would be the end of my discussion.

15 All right. Mr. Schiavo.

16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. We'll go ahead
17 and start off with Committee Item B. And this will be
18 consideration of the amended nondisposal facility element
19 for the unincorporated San Diego County. And Zane Poulson
20 will present.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: No report, Schiavo?
22 Everything is up to date. Way to go.

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Stay patient. It will
24 be at the end.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: This is probably the smallest

1 meeting this Committee has had in about the last six
2 months, I guess, six or seven months. This Committee has
3 worked hard to get through all the biannual reviews and
4 get people their 1066s. And actually a few of them, we
5 got them their compliance orders. So we've done a lot of
6 work in the last few months.

7 I do want to say before we start this meeting
8 that this will be the last meeting of this committee as
9 it's currently formed. The Chair and Board under the
10 Chair has -- because of Bagley-Keene and other things,
11 we're going to three-member Committees.

12 This committee is going to be renamed. It's
13 actually going to merge with the Markets Committee, and
14 it's going to be called the Sustainability Markets
15 Committee and DPLA.

16 The membership is going to be -- the Chair has
17 asked me to be the Chair of this Committee, which I
18 appreciate -- Ms. Peace, and Carl Washington. So we are
19 going to miss the Chair, Moulton-Patterson who's done an
20 incredible on this Committee, as well as Mr. Medina, our
21 Vice Chair. We do appreciate it.

22 I do want to say that I'm going to talk to
23 Mr. Schiavo and Patty Wohl about what I want to see in
24 this committee and how things get presented. But I'll
25 give you a little update on it.

1 I want to see the markets and the sustainability
2 items first, for a very simple reason. The DPLA will come
3 after. It doesn't discount either one. We're able to
4 have a committee to talk about sustainability and market
5 development, only because of the efforts of cities and
6 counties and our citizens of this state, as well as this
7 division of the Board, that's recovering 48 percent of the
8 material in the state of California. Getting it recovered
9 is only part of this -- part of this program.

10 We have got to have markets to get that material
11 into. Without it, this becomes an exercise in futility.
12 So it is critical that cities and counties understand
13 their efforts to divert only become realized when the
14 efforts of market development and sustainability continue
15 to grow.

16 So I don't want staff of DPLA to think you're
17 getting put last for any other reason than your work has
18 been so incredible that the Chair determined that we need
19 to be talking about sustainability, zero waste, our new
20 technologies, and market development. And it's only as a
21 result of the efforts of the citizens and cities and
22 counties that California can do that. And that is a
23 tremendous kudo to all of our jurisdictions.

24 So I wanted to lay that out so there will be no
25 misunderstanding as to how I expect these Committee

1 meetings to be structured. And we'll talk about the
2 details.

3 All right, Zane. Go ahead.

4 MR. POULSON: Good morning. Good morning,
5 Chairman and Committee members.

6 The unincorporated San Diego County has amended
7 its Nondisposal Facility Element, or NDFE, by identifying
8 and describing 38 additional facilities, of which ten are
9 located within the unincorporated area.

10 One of the facilities added to the unincorporated
11 area of San Diego County is the Fallbrook Recycling and
12 Transfer Station.

13 Agenda Item 5 of the Board's agenda is for the
14 Board's consideration of a revised solid waste facility
15 permit for the Fallbrook Recycling and Transfer Station.
16 All of the required information for the Fallbrook facility
17 is included in the revised NDFE.

18 However, the County's proposed amendment to the
19 NDFE does not include all the required information for
20 eight of the facilities located within the unincorporated
21 San Diego County that the County is proposing to add to
22 their NDFE.

23 Board staff is therefore recommending that the
24 County's proposed amendment to its NDFE be conditionally
25 approved, and that the County be required to supply the

1 required information for the eight facilities in the
2 county's 2002 Annual Report.

3 This concludes staff presentation.

4 Are there any questions?

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

6 I have one question.

7 Is there anybody from the County that needs to
8 speak to this?

9 MR. POULSON: They're not here today.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: It's only eight that are
11 lacking the information, out of all -- I mean, that are
12 short of the information.

13 So we're approving the NDFE. And those that are
14 complete, they're not conditional. It's the eight that
15 are in question that are conditional?

16 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: That's correct. The
17 condition is for the ones that are incomplete.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I just think it's important,
19 because one of them has a permit due, and I don't want
20 there to be an issue that this was a
21 conditionally-approved NDFE.

22 So -- Ms. Peace?

23 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I would like to move
24 Resolution Number 2003-298, Consideration of the Amended
25 Nondisposal Facility Element for Unincorporated San Diego

1 County.

2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll second
3 that.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We have a motion by
5 Ms. Peace, a second by Moulton-Patterson.

6 Would you please call the roll.

7 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

8 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

9 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Peace?

10 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

11 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.

13 This will go on consent, members. Okay?

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay.

15 Zane will also be presenting Committee Item C,
16 and this is Consideration of the Amended Household
17 Hazardous Waste Element for Unincorporated San Diego
18 County.

19 MR. POULSON: Good morning, again, Chairman and
20 Committee members.

21 The unincorporated area of San Diego County has
22 amended its household hazardous waste element, or HHWE, by
23 identifying and describing changes in the County's
24 household hazardous waste programs and changes in the
25 facilities used by the County.

1 The County has submitted all the required
2 documentation, and Board staff therefore recommend
3 approval of the County's amended HHWE.

4 This concludes staff presentation.

5 Are there any questions?

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Questions, members?

7 Ms. Peace?

8 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move Resolution
9 Number 2003-299, consideration of the Amended Household
10 Hazardous Waste for Unincorporated San Diego County.

11 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by
13 Ms. Peace, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

14 Substitute the previous roll and put it on
15 consent.

16 Thank you, members.

17 Next item.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Committee Item D is
19 Consideration of the Amended Nondisposal Facility Element
20 for the Unincorporated Riverside County.

21 Melissa Vargas will present.

22 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Chairman and Committee
23 members.

24 The unincorporated area of Riverside County has
25 amended its nondisposal facility element, NDFE, by

1 identifying and describing the Edom Hill Transfer Station
2 Material Recovery Facility, which is a new facility. It
3 will serve the county of Riverside and cities within the
4 Coachella Valley that may include the cities of Cathedral
5 City, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, La Quinta, Palm
6 Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage.

7 The Permits and Enforcement Division will be
8 presenting an agenda item for the proposed permit for this
9 facility in the future.

10 The County has submitted all required
11 documentation.

12 The Board staff, therefore, recommends approval
13 of the amendment to Riverside County's NDFE.

14 This concludes my presentation.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

16 Ms. Moulton-Patterson.

17 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
18 Mr. Jones.

19 I'd like to move approval of Resolution 2003-300,
20 Consideration of the Amended Nondisposal Facility Element
21 for the Unincorporated Riverside County.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I'll second.

23 We've got a motion by Chair Moulton-Patterson,
24 we've got a second by Jones.

25 Substitute the previous roll. On consent.

1 Next item.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item E is Consideration
3 of a Request to Extend the Due Date for Submittal of the
4 Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Household
5 Hazardous Waste Element, and Nondisposal Facility Element
6 by the City of Rancho Santa Margarita, in Orange County.

7 And Melissa will present this item.

8 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Chair, and Board
9 members again.

10 The City of Rancho Santa Margarita was
11 incorporated on January 1st, 2000, and its final draft
12 SREE, HHWE, and NDFE were due July 1st, 2001.

13 The City was initially granted an extension till
14 August 3 of 2002.

15 The City is requesting a second extension to
16 submit the final documents by August 31st, 2003.

17 Staff recommends Option 1, approve the extension
18 request with the staff recommended stepwise compliance
19 procedure.

20 Board staff determined the reasons for an
21 extension are adequate, and the extension period is
22 reasonable. However, Board staff believes that the
23 additional time should not be granted without also
24 providing for more efficient enforcement should the new
25 due date also be missed.

1 Staff is recommending that the Board provide
2 notice through the resolution for this item and its
3 transmittal to the City, that a hearing is being scheduled
4 for the Board to consider imposing penalties for failure
5 to submit the required planning documents for the regular
6 monthly September Board meeting immediately following the
7 new due date.

8 If the required documents are submitted and
9 complete by the due date, August 31st, 2003, the hearing
10 will be taken off of the agenda.

11 But if not, the Board will hold a penalty hearing
12 at the next Board meeting, without the need to provide
13 additional notice or time.

14 Representatives for the City and the consultant
15 are here to answer any additional questions.

16 This concludes my presentation.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I have a question.

18 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: If the final draft was due
19 in August of 2002, why is it just now that they're asking
20 for another extension?

21 MS. MORGAN: Cara Morgan, Office of Local
22 Assistance.

23 Basically, they did submit it by the due date,
24 August 2002. And then Staff had to review that draft
25 document.

1 We provided them comments in January, which
2 really explained that there was more work that needed to
3 be done.

4 And that's why Staff feel that this second
5 extension request is needed, so that they can answer
6 Staff's questions and prepare that final document.

7 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I just had one other
8 question.

9 On the back of the resolution, very back, where
10 it says, "Hereby notifies the City of Rancho Santa
11 Margarita that a hearing has been scheduled for the
12 Board's February 2004," should that be September?

13 MS. MORGAN: September.

14 And it should actually be 2003.

15 We'll note the change.

16 Any more questions?

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good catch, Ms. Peace.

18 I do have a question.

19 This hearing is -- I think this is a good way to
20 do this resolution. I mean, you can only give so many
21 extensions, and it's consistent with the way we have done
22 business from day one.

23 But I'm hoping that everybody is aware that this
24 is not going to be a hearing to be put on a compliance
25 schedule, because they're on a compliance schedule.

1 This is going to be a meeting similar to the ones
2 that we held in '98, where we determined the extent of the
3 penalties.

4 And everybody is aware of that. This is -- and
5 the city is aware of it, wherever the cities are. Okay.

6 I just want to make sure it was clear, because we
7 did this in '98, and four jurisdictions had gone way past
8 the extension. We gave them a little longer. Two
9 actually got them in, and two didn't.

10 So, Madam Chair.

11 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Thank
12 you, Mr. Jones.

13 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-301,
14 Consideration of Request to Extend the Due Date for the
15 Submittal of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element,
16 Household Hazardous Waste Element, and Nondisposal
17 Facility Element by the City of Rancho Santa Margarita,
18 Orange County.

19 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
21 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Ms. Peace.

22 Substitute the previous roll. On consent.

23 Thank you, members.

24 Next item.

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Committee Item F is

1 Consideration of a Request to Extend the Due Date for
2 Submittal of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element,
3 Household Hazardous Waste Element and Nondisposal Facility
4 Element by the City of Elk Grove in Sacramento County.

5 Steve Sorelle will present.

6 MR. SORELLE: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
7 Committee members.

8 The City of Elk Grove incorporated on July 1st,
9 2000. Elk Grove's 18-month time frame to submit planning
10 documents ended January 1st, 2002, and the City was
11 subsequently granted an extension, based on the Board's
12 approval have their compliance schedule until January
13 31st, 2003.

14 The City originally felt that joining the
15 Sacramento County, City of Citrus Heights Regional Agency
16 was the most realistic option for meeting their planning
17 requirements.

18 Through discussions with the Regional Agency, the
19 City determined that creating its own planning documents
20 was the best course of action, due to concerns with
21 revenue sharing and landfill liability issues.

22 Elk Grove is requesting another extension, based
23 on the time line, Attachment 1 to the agenda item, to
24 submit its planning documents by January 31st, 2004.

25 Board staff determined the reasons for a time

1 extension are adequate, and the extension period is
2 reasonable.

3 However, to ensure more efficient enforcement, if
4 necessary, the Board is providing notice in the agenda
5 item resolution that a hearing will be held at the
6 February 2004 Board meeting to consider imposing
7 penalties, should the new due date be missed.

8 Staff feels it is important to note that the City
9 has continued to implement commercial and residential
10 waste diversion programs, although the planning documents
11 are not yet completed.

12 That concludes my presentation.

13 Representatives from the City are available to
14 answer questions. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Questions, members?
16 Chair?

17 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

18 I know the Elk Grove School District is a
19 fast-growing school district.

20 Are you working with the schools in any way on
21 education?

22 MR. OVIEDO: Frank Oviedo, assistant to the City
23 Manager in Elk Grove.

24 Chris Weed, who works with Central Valley Waste
25 Management, prior to the city's incorporation, did a lot

1 of that work for waste management. She continues to do
2 that work.

3 And we expect to, once we get all the planning
4 documents, and we do our solid waste contract, that we'll
5 not only continue those, but we'll enhance those programs.

6 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: That's what I
7 like to hear. You are a fast-growing district, aren't
8 you?

9 MR. OVIEDO: Yes, we are.

10 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I understand.

11 Okay. With that, if no one else has questions --
12 do you have questions, Mr. Jones?

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I have one question of Staff.

14 I met with Mr. Greco yesterday. They're
15 comfortable with the time line. They've got a little bit
16 of an issue with some of the task force stuff because of
17 the timing and the 90 days. They're pretty sure that
18 they're going to get that done.

19 Is there anything that we can do to help
20 streamline -- I mean, are they dependent on us getting
21 work out for them, to get through all of their planning
22 documents locally? Probably not.

23 MR. SORELLE: I don't think so.

24 And frankly, one of our very good staff members
25 is working closely with them and is in constant

1 communication.

2 So I have confidence, based on that.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well, I have
4 confidence with them doing it. I know the time lines
5 are -- so maybe this resolution helps them push the locals
6 to get these meetings agendized. All right.

7 Who would like to make this motion -- Madam
8 Chair.

9 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Thank
10 you.

11 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-302,
12 Consideration of the Request to Extend the Due Date for
13 Submittal of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element,
14 Household Hazardous Waste Element and Nondisposal Facility
15 Element by the City of Elk Grove, Sacramento County.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Easy for you to say.

17 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Chair
19 Moulton-Patterson, second by Ms. Peace.

20 Substitute the previous roll. On consent.

21 Thank you, members.

22 Next item.

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Next item is Committee
24 Item G. And this is a status update on the venues and
25 special events waste reduction project.

1 Chris Schmidle will present this item.

2 MR. SCHMIDLE: Good morning, Board members and
3 Chair.

4 Since the fall of 2001, DPLA staff has been
5 working to provide resources and motivation to the large
6 venues and special events industry, to assist them in
7 planning and implementing waste reduction and recycling
8 plans.

9 The objectives of the venues program include
10 identifying waste reduction best practices and developing
11 industry-specific tools and resources for use by venues
12 and events managers and jurisdiction recycling
13 coordinators; developing cost-effective ways to distribute
14 ways about waste diversion to venues, jurisdictions and
15 the public, such as workshops and web site; developing a
16 peer-to-peer diversion information and assistance network,
17 connecting venues and event staff, industry and
18 professional associations, local jurisdictions and State
19 agencies; and closely coordinating DPLA efforts and
20 opportunities with those of other divisions of the Board
21 and external entities.

22 Some highlights of the recent DPLA internal and
23 external coordination include assisting the California
24 Resource Recovery Association and continued development of
25 a venues and special events recycling counsel, also called

1 VETER; a technical committee focusing on waste reduction
2 at large venues and events; participating in the rollout
3 of expanded recycling and composting programs at the
4 Pacific Life Open Tennis Tournament in March; providing
5 planning assistance for expanded recycling and composting
6 at the upcoming Gilroy Garlic Festival this July;
7 coordinating with the Board's legislative affairs office
8 in analyzing AB 734, a proposal for increased venues and
9 events recycling; participating in the Board's waste
10 prevention and market development division's effort to
11 open a dialogue with the National Association for PET
12 Container Resources, also known as NAPCR, on ways to
13 increase plastic beverage container recycling at large
14 venues; and coordinating with the Department of
15 Conservation, Division of Recycling, to develop self-help
16 recycling brochures for jurisdictions to hand out with
17 their park and events permits.

18 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
19 presented as follows.)

20 MR. SCHMIDLE: Now, turning to the area of venues
21 industry education efforts, I'd like to offer a first look
22 at the proposed Board venues information web site.

23 --o0o--

24 MR. SCHMIDLE: Staff has developed more than 35
25 draft web pages of specialized information that will be

1 rolled out to the public in July 2003.

2 However, I would like to take a moment now to
3 give you a very brief live preview tour of the site.

4 If we take a look at -- the venues web site is
5 set them as a special interest portal, directed
6 specifically at professional, public and private sector
7 industry personnel for large venues and events, and the
8 local recycling coordinators who work with them.

9 However, casual public users will also find basic
10 assistance for recycling at smaller events. The site has
11 original information and downloadable tools, but also
12 features many links to existing Board and external sites.
13 These resources are focused specifically on the typical
14 waste materials and diversion programs found at special
15 events.

16 Our goal is not to duplicate or compete with
17 assistance found on other parts of the Board web, but
18 rather to make it easier and faster for the target
19 audience to find information with the highest useable
20 content to them.

21 The pages walk users through planning of a
22 program, and address the fundamental stages of
23 implementation, such as project financing, waste analysis
24 and program selection, worker training and attendee
25 education.

1 Some specific features of the site -- and I'm
2 going to go through the pages here very quickly for you --
3 --o0o--

4 MR. SCHMIDLE: -- is downloadable examples of
5 sample municipal waste reduction ordinances and
6 environmental guidelines for voluntary regulation of large
7 venues and events, links to jurisdiction that have venues
8 ordinances or policies in place, and downloadable examples
9 of sample recycling operations, policies, for use by
10 facility managers.

11 --o0o--

12 MR. SCHMIDLE: We also have program planning
13 information, such as how to organize a green team on site,
14 get management support for recycling, and develop a waste
15 reduction plan.

16 --o0o--

17 MR. SCHMIDLE: We also have summary waste
18 characterization data from other studies, other venues and
19 events, advice on how to do a venue waste
20 characterization, including process steps, sampling and
21 health and safety consideration; and a downloadable sample
22 data collection form, based on the Board's standard waste
23 characterization methods.

24 --o0o--

25 MR. SCHMIDLE: In the area of financing, we have

1 program financing assistance, such as a form for
2 estimating program costs and benefits, and help in
3 researching grants and finding other funding for your
4 programs.

5 --o0o--

6 MR. SCHMIDLE: Also in the implementation page,
7 we have program implementation assistance, such as a
8 sample program that shows -- calculates the results of
9 your program on a spreadsheet, and case studies of
10 successful programs.

11 Also downloadable staff training resources and
12 guides that can be use by local governments during audits
13 of their facilities.

14 --o0o--

15 MR. SCHMIDLE: In the area of publicity, we have
16 publicity and recognition advice, such as how to use waste
17 reduction results in venue publicity and marketing
18 campaigns.

19 --o0o--

20 MR. SCHMIDLE: We also have a technical resources
21 page that gives links to other board and local agency and
22 private industry sites, such as recycled content product
23 suppliers and recycled material buyers.

24 Also included on the site are pages for
25 announcements of news events and a glossary.

1 More information will be added to the site over
2 time, especially more links to venues industry sites,
3 technical resources and case studies.

4 I'd like to acknowledge the great amount of
5 assistance and terrific service we've received from the
6 Board's webmaster's office and staff in the development of
7 these pages.

8 Now I'd like to mention some of the next steps
9 that will be undertaken by the venues project, depending
10 on availability of resources. And they include
11 participating in venues and events waste reduction
12 workshops at the annual CRRA conference in Ontario in
13 July; developing a marketing plan to publicize the venues
14 and events web pages to jurisdictions and the venues and
15 events industry; coordinating with the Board's AB 75 State
16 Agency assistance section, to research and develop one or
17 more pilot programs for the food waste diversion at State
18 venue facilities such as fairgrounds and parks;
19 coordinating with the Board's office of local assistance
20 in providing help to jurisdictions with significant venue
21 and event waste generation amounts; and finally,
22 networking with representatives of major venues and events
23 professional associations, to gain their cooperation and
24 endorsement of implementing waste reduction programs among
25 their members.

1 Staff will continue to bring regular information
2 updates to the Board as the project progresses.

3 And that's the end of my report.

4 Do you have any questions for me about the
5 program?

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, questions.

7 Madam Chair.

8 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: How do you
9 approach, like say, Arco Arena or Staples Center; or how
10 is that done? Do they come to you, do we come to them,
11 or --

12 MR. SCHMIDLE: At this point, it's very difficult
13 to find arenas that are willing to voluntarily come to us.

14 What we've been looking for is case studies and
15 pilots and prototypes.

16 What we find is that although they appreciate the
17 information from us, what they're really looking for is
18 somebody else who's done it. Okay.

19 So the baseball stadium wants to talk to another
20 baseball stadium. So I think our case studies and pilot
21 studies are going to be extremely important in this area.

22 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: So for instance,
23 like Staples Center would want to talk to Moscone, and
24 Moscone has -- and you have a case study on that?

25 MR. SCHMIDLE: Yes. We have a case study on

1 Moscone.

2 And this is part of the reason we go to CRRA, to
3 present these case studies that will have, I think, four
4 of them coming up the July.

5 We'll also be putting these on our web site.

6 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Has LAX been
7 cooperative?

8 MR. SCHMIDLE: Yes. They have been very
9 cooperative. They're another of our case studies, and
10 they have a very good program out there. And we hope to
11 expand that to other airports in the state.

12 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: The reason I ask
13 is, I have an appointment with Mayor Hahn tomorrow. And I
14 was thinking if there's anything I could say about Staples
15 or something -- you know, the cities do have influence
16 there.

17 Because I think it's a great program. And I
18 think it's really great. And anything that we can do, as
19 Board members, to encourage large venues like that
20 to cooperate --

21 MR. SCHMIDLE: I think many of the venues and
22 events are interested in doing bottles and cans and
23 cardboard.

24 The real challenge is going to be getting them to
25 move beyond that, to move into the area of foods, and all

1 the plastic materials they're using for food service.

2 So I think the idea is not just to do any
3 program, but to do a comprehensive program. And that's
4 our emphasis on doing waste characterization, finding out
5 what's in your waste stream.

6 And from our pilot studies we've done with the
7 '49ers, they were quite surprised at what kinds of
8 materials and the amount of different kinds of materials
9 there were in the waste stream. That was very different
10 than what they originally thought.

11 So I think that getting them to sit down and do a
12 comprehensive plan is going to be the real challenge.

13 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Thank
14 you.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Peace?

16 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: These large venues, what --
17 are there any incentives to get them to participate? What
18 makes them want to participate in these programs?

19 MR. SCHMIDLE: Well, right now, there's no legal
20 mandate they have to.

21 I think the pressure comes from two areas. First
22 is, internally, they can save some money. The Moscone
23 Center, for example, saved about 50 percent of their waste
24 fee, which turned out to be a quarter of a million
25 dollars, by implementing programs.

1 That's not, of course, exactly duplicated in
2 every venue. It goes -- because each venue is different.
3 And that's an interesting problem.

4 The second one will be coming from jurisdictions.

5 They usually lease those sites. There's some
6 kinds of permit or use conditions put on those sites. And
7 each of those jurisdictions needs to make the 50 percent
8 and get beyond the 50 percent.

9 The interesting thing about a venue or large
10 event is that you can get the waste from 200- to 300,000
11 people over a weekend. And so that can be very
12 significant, particularly for some smaller communities
13 that have fairgrounds or baseball stadiums in their area.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I think that there's a couple
15 of examples that we need to -- you know, this is one where
16 we need to start growing the audience. You know, CRRRA,
17 you're talking to the believers.

18 And truthfully, I challenge them all the time
19 that I don't ever see any new faces in that crowd.

20 It's pretty easy to talk to somebody who's been
21 coming to this thing for 15 years. They've heard it.
22 They understand it.

23 What we ought to be looking at is a couple
24 different things. You bring up Moscone Center. Now I'm
25 putting the business side on, okay, so just bear with me

1 for a minute.

2 My old company was the exclusive hauler in that
3 area. So all the programs, either Candlestick, at Pac
4 Bell, or Moscone, were done by that exclusive hauler, who
5 had an opportunity to recycle all the cardboard, recycle
6 the plastic, and composted all the food waste; right?

7 MR. SCHMIDLE: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: What we need to start doing
9 is looking at Staples, talking to Staples and say, "Okay.
10 What's your system?" That's an open system down there; so
11 they've got multiple haulers that haul.

12 Do those haulers have the ability to take the
13 food waste to composter? If the answer's no, then we need
14 to be saying -- you know, we need to be putting matrixes
15 together that say, not to infringe on business, but to
16 say, these are the kinds of things that you need, to put
17 these programs the place.

18 You know, it doesn't do any good to segregate
19 food waste as a program, if there's no ability to compost
20 it. There is, in that region. But it may only be
21 certain -- you know, certain folks.

22 And I'm not trying to take business away from
23 somebody, or not. But we need to start figuring out how
24 to connect the dots, to say, "These are the pieces that
25 you need, to be able to contract with, so that you can get

1 these diversion pieces." You know what I'm saying?

2 MR. SCHMIDLE: Uh-huh.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And then, the venues for the
4 professional associations, there's got to be some kind of
5 a convention or a seminar for people that manage those
6 venues, because you only learn from those types of events.

7 So we need to be talking to the people that run
8 Staples and Moscone, and find out, "Okay. You're normally
9 the host of these conventions, or the facility. Where do
10 you go? Where's your convention," to figure out what's
11 new out there.

12 And then we should be -- we should have a booth
13 there. And we should be talking to those folks, because
14 you've got them captive. You know what I mean? I think
15 we've got to start expanding our message, but also have
16 some kind of a business matrix in place, because they'll
17 understand that.

18 There going to ask, "Okay. That's pretty cool.
19 What do I have to do?" And it's easy to say, "Okay, are
20 you in an area that you have an exclusive hauler?"
21 "Yeah." "Okay. What do they provide? Because these are
22 the things you need."

23 You know. We don't have to direct them. We
24 don't have to tell them they've got to stop doing
25 business. That's not my intent.

1 But I think we need to -- and I know you guys
2 have the ability, because -- so we just need to expand
3 this a little bit, and get to their home.

4 CRAA, they're going to preach this all day long.
5 No problem. You know, you need supporters. None of them
6 are the guys that make decision at these places.

7 So we need to start looking at those kinds of
8 activities. That's how we're going to grow this thing.
9 You know what I'm saying? I think that would be money
10 well spent for us, and effort well spent.

11 But it's like our trade show. Our trade show is
12 incredibly important. But we really, we invite government
13 entities. We need to start figuring out how to get our
14 trade participants into other conventions, where they're
15 looking at an audience that they want to see. And maybe
16 there's room there for us to start thinking about helping
17 to somehow co -- not co-sponsor the event, but figure out
18 a way to get them into those places, because that's where
19 they're going to -- they can get the government, but they
20 need to get that private industry.

21 And we need to start looking at expanding, I
22 think, or at least talking about it, you know.

23 So, any other questions?

24 All right. Chris, thank you very much. That was
25 a great presentation. We appreciate it. There's a lot of

1 potential for that.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This next item is going
3 to be Committee Item H. And this is Consideration of the
4 Grants Awards for the Unified Education Strategy Grant for
5 Cycle One, Fiscal Year 2002/2003 and Fiscal Year 2003/2004
6 and for Cycle Two 2002/2003 and Fiscal Year 2003/2004.

7 And Tricia Broddrick from the Office of
8 Integrated Education will present this item.

9 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BRODDRICK: Good morning.
10 Tricia Broddrick from the Office of Integrated Education.

11 This is the second type of grants that we are
12 offering through the Senate Bill 337 school deal programs.

13 The first grants that were approved by the board
14 were the environmental ambassadors. Those are our model
15 school districts, and there are ten school districts we're
16 funding, under that aspect of the program.

17 What you have before you today are the Unified
18 Education Strategy Grants. These are grants for school
19 districts who either do not have a program in place, and
20 choose to develop one, or have a fledgling program and
21 want to augment it in one aspect or another.

22 Again, through the school deal program, what we
23 are attempting to do is to unify and integrate classroom
24 instructional programs with on-site resource conservation
25 and resource management. So the focus of these grants

1 will be to provide funding and technical support to the
2 school districts in developing integrated education
3 programs, primarily in waste management, but possibly, as
4 well, expanding into energy, water and air quality.

5 We had a total of 16 applications. We're
6 recommending funding for 14 of these.

7 Full funding would be \$27,000. This would be the
8 first year of phase one funding. And these school
9 districts then have the option, and will be encouraged to,
10 apply for next year funding for implementation.

11 So this is for the planning aspect.
12 Implementation would take place in Year Two.

13 We had a pretty good demographic, geographic
14 representation. With the small number of applications, we
15 were pleasantly surprised with the north and south
16 distribution.

17 We only have three applications or applicants
18 recommended for funding in Southern California, but they
19 represent a very large percentage. Way beyond 50 percent
20 of the student populations will be served in this grant
21 program.

22 In addition, we have over 50 percent of the
23 students are being serviced with the free reduced lunch
24 program, which means that a lot of the students who will
25 be participating in this program are from underserved

1 populations.

2 So with that, I'd be happy to answer any
3 questions that you have regarding this program, regarding
4 the applications and the agenda item.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

6 I already know who's going to make the motion,
7 but I'll see if there's any questions.

8 Ms. Peace.

9 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Each of these grants is for
10 \$27,000. Can you give me an example of like what a school
11 is going to do with this \$27,000?

12 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BRODDRICK: Well, what we
13 have, we're targeting sixth grade only, so the focus --
14 one of the aspects of the school deal is that we work with
15 the State Board of Education, the Department of Education,
16 in developing the resource materials that will be
17 supporting the instructional aspects of the program.

18 And as a result, we are trying -- we are
19 attempting to align the materials with standards and with
20 the textbooks. And as a result, we decided to focus on
21 sixth grade only.

22 So it doesn't seem like a whole lot of money, but
23 a lot of -- their funding will be used for professional
24 development, to provide release time for the teachers to
25 leave the classroom, to work in teams, to work with our

1 consultants, to develop lesson plans that will have the
2 students connected with and involved in conducting audits
3 on the school campus site; and will provide the teachers
4 with an opportunity to align these environmental programs
5 with their existing lesson plans and curricula, in science
6 and other subject areas, as well.

7 And the additional funding that I was referring
8 to earlier is coming from State and Consumers Services
9 Agency. They are responsible for energy education through
10 emergency legislation that was provided a couple of years
11 ago. They have provided us with over \$500,000 to develop
12 support materials. And as a result, none of this funding
13 will be used to develop resource materials for the
14 programs.

15 This funding is merely to provide release time
16 for the teachers, travel expenses, and those types of
17 logistical expenditures, to get the teachers in position
18 and provide them time to interface with our consultants to
19 get the program going.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Is the -- are the consultants
21 going to develop different criteria for each district, or
22 is there a set criteria, and then you take an input, or
23 how does that work?

24 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BRODDRICK: It's going to be
25 customized for each district. And each district program

1 is different. Some of them will be focusing on, you know,
2 various aspects of waste management.

3 Others, because of their -- you know, maybe
4 because they may be rural versus urban, will be focused on
5 composting versus recycling.

6 The consultants, what they do is, they bring in a
7 strategy -- an instructional strategy, that they provide
8 training to the teachers on.

9 The teachers themselves will be considered the
10 experts in the -- in their area of instruction, and will
11 use the strategy to develop their own lesson plans,
12 focusing on their textbooks that they have adopted through
13 their districts, working with local community support
14 groups, who will be part of the institutes and training
15 that we have in the summer, will be invited to
16 participate.

17 So through these teams and the support of
18 consultants, they'll be designing their own customized
19 programs.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

21 Madam Chair?

22 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I just wanted
23 to -- you mentioned the \$500,000. That was made possible
24 through the cooperation of Secretary Adams at Consumer
25 Affairs and Arnie Sowell. I just wanted to point that

1 out, that that was great that we could work with another
2 agency on that cooperatively.

3 Also, on page 26-5, I see strategy E is
4 maintaining regular communication with CalEPA's other
5 boards, departments and offices.

6 How often do you meet with them?

7 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BRODDRICK: Once a month.

8 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Once a month.

9 Great. Thank you.

10 MS. BRODDERICK: We have a meeting next Monday.

11 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. With
12 that, if there aren't any other questions, I'll move
13 2003-2003, Consideration of the Grant Awards for the
14 Unified Education Strategy Grant Program for Cycle One,
15 Fiscal Year 2002/2003 and Fiscal Year 2003/2004, and for
16 Cycle Two, 2002/2003 and Fiscal Year 2003/2004.

17 And I want to say, Trish, that you and your team,
18 and Pat, and everyone that's worked together on this,
19 we're really proud of all the effort.

20 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BRODDRICK: I think that's a
21 really important point, because DPLA has been an
22 incredible partner in this. And I want to recognize Cara
23 and Pat, in particular. Every step of the way, they've
24 been very, very helpful. We couldn't do it without them.

25 In addition, the other State agencies are

1 involved in this department. We have the Department of
2 Water Resources, State Water Resources Control Board, the
3 Air Resources Board, State and Consumer Services, and the
4 Energy Commission. All have provided technical assistance
5 to review these materials, and have just been fantastic.
6 So we've got great partners.

7 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I know Secretary
8 Hickox, as well as myself, were really happy to brag to
9 Superintendent O'Connell about our programs. And I know
10 it's taken a lot of hard work by all of you. Thank you.

11 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: I'll second that.

12 CHAIRPERSON MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion
13 by Chair Moulton-Patterson, second by Ms. Peace.

14 Substitute the previous roll. Fiscal consensus.

15 And, Madam Chair, I think everybody owes you and
16 Bonnie and your staff a lot of credit for pushing and
17 pushing and pushing and -- all right.

18 This is a -- this is our last item, but it is a
19 critically important item. And as we go through this, I
20 would ask the members of the committee to be thinking of
21 if there are parts of this that should be summarized for
22 our Board meeting. Maybe not the entire presentation, but
23 I think there are some pieces that really are important to
24 get the message out at our Board meeting. So I'll wait
25 until the end of the presentation to hear it.

1 And when I reviewed it, I -- just makes me
2 appreciate this Staff that much more. Go ahead.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item I is Discussion of
4 Historical Progress and Current Achievement of the
5 Diversion Goals and Request for Direction Regarding Future
6 Program Implementation Efforts.

7 And before I start, I'd just like to thank all
8 the efforts of Lorene and Cara and Phil and the staff who
9 actually put the presentation work together, as well as
10 did all the activities that are shown in the presentation.

11 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
12 presented as follows.)

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: The item you have that
14 was contained in the Board agenda is our long version. It
15 was presented to you for a reference guide. It has a lot
16 of excellent information. It's to be used as a reference
17 guide for you, whenever you need little tidbits of
18 information or want to see what's going on.

19 For today's presentation, I'll abbreviate that,
20 although there's still quite a few slides, because there's
21 a lot of information we want to make sure that's conveyed
22 to you.

23 Over the past several months, at the Board
24 meetings you've been presented with implementation
25 strategies and efforts for implementing the different

1 strategic planning goals.

2 So today, what we're doing is presenting you with
3 DPLA's efforts in implementing the goals related to DPLA.
4 *(Tape 1, side 1 ends here) And there's a reference
5 slide at the end of the presentation. You can look at to
6 see when the goals are effected through DPLA.

7 Today's presentation will include a look at our
8 historical performance, our automated systems, development
9 of our efforts at creating additional measurement
10 accuracy, as well as a look the future and where we'd like
11 to go.

12 --o0o--

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: On this slide -- this
14 is a familiar slide you see every year. What it shows is
15 that we're at 48 percent diversion, which is very
16 important.

17 And what I'd like to do is do a quick comparison,
18 is that many states -- or most states that I've seen --
19 are limited to implementing programs that are limited by
20 material type geography or other consideration.

21 In California, we certainly include everything
22 everywhere. Ours is by far the most comprehensive that
23 you'll find.

24 Another little tidbit that you can see on this
25 table is on the far left-hand side, you see that in 1989,

1 we were diverting approximately 10 percent of materials,
2 and we're managing the disposal of 90 percent of material
3 stream. Today we're managing almost 50 percent of the
4 material stream as commodity, no longer disposal. That's
5 really critical.

6 --o0o--

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: I have a three-ring
8 circus with my pages.

9 On this table we have a line chart that shows
10 program implementation efforts. And as you can see by
11 that line chart, our program implementation has grown up
12 dramatically.

13 And what this shows is a -- creates a large
14 dynamic marketplace and infrastructure that's been created
15 as a result of this program. And as a result, we have
16 increased the job market by over 100,000 employees. Value
17 added product has estimated between 5- to \$10 billion,
18 salaries up to \$5 billion.

19 And those figures are the result of two
20 Board-funded studies that have been completed recently,
21 and that are actually up on our web site. So if you'd
22 like to see referencing to them, that's available. That's
23 critical information as far as benefits to our economy.

24 --o0o--

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This next slide shows

1 bars in -- the number represents actually jurisdiction on
2 the far 64 jurisdictions that were at 50 percent. Today
3 there's 207. Huge increase.

4 And then I think the other number of note is, if
5 you look on the very top on the left-hand slide, there are
6 80 in the lighter blue. There are 87 jurisdictions that
7 could not calculate their numbers, had measurement
8 accuracy issues.

9 Today there's only 18 jurisdictions that are in
10 that situation. That's a huge improvement. We're very
11 proud of that.

12 --o0o--

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: What this shows is
14 performance, looking at Southern California and the
15 performance, the -- meeting the 2000 goal. There's 44
16 percent of the jurisdictions that have met the goals, and
17 there's 40 percent of the jurisdictions are actually doing
18 SB 1066 extensions, and 10 percent of the jurisdictions
19 that are considered good faith effort.

20 --o0o--

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: On comparison, we have
22 Northern California, which has slightly more jurisdictions
23 that have met the goal. There's 53 percent versus the 44
24 that you saw on the last side. Good faith efforts
25 designation was 14 percent in both categories.

1 And you can see in Northern California, if you're
2 looking at diversion efforts themselves.

3 My suspicion is that Southern California
4 diversion rate overall is probably a little bit higher
5 because of Los Angeles, which is about 60 percent, and
6 because of the population in the waste stream, probably
7 brought their actual rate up a little bit higher.

8 --o0o--

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This next slide shows
10 you that State agency reporting, in the planning phase in
11 2000 we had total of
12 all agencies reported to us and were successful in getting
13 their plans in. It took a little bit of time, but it
14 happened.

15 In 2001, we still have a few reports that are
16 outstanding. We're still working on getting those in.

17 And in 2002, we have about 100 reports that are
18 outstanding. That doesn't mean they were good; it means
19 that we haven't received them yet.

20 But the application due date was April 1st, 2003;
21 so that's typically the process. We have to hammer away
22 at them, and we'll get them in eventually. That will
23 happen.

24 --o0o--

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: What this table, this

1 little Sin City table shows you, is when we're in our
2 planning phase here at the Board. We were reviewing
3 nondisposal facility elements, the source reduction
4 recycling element, household hazardous waste element,
5 summary plan slighting elements.

6 This workload has changed dramatically. We're
7 now into what I would call performance based cycle, in
8 which we're actually reviewing performance of
9 jurisdictions and trying to get them to work with them to
10 implement additional programs. And now we're looking at
11 annual reports, State agency annual reports, biannual
12 reviews, time extensions. So we're being more proactive
13 at this point the time. The workload hasn't changed; in
14 fact, it's probably gone up.

15 --o0o--

16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We're going to now head
17 into the automation phase of this presentation. And in
18 the beginning, we essentially didn't have any automation
19 available for jurisdictions. They had to hand calculate
20 their diversion rates. It was very complex for them. It
21 took a lot of time. There's a lot of information -- you
22 know, misinformation, because they were working with other
23 jurisdictions or peers. It wasn't easy or fun.

24 Also, where the public now has easy access to
25 everything that we do, back then, they had to either come

1 to the Board to view documents, or we had to mail to them
2 pieces of documents, because that's just the way the
3 system worked at that time.

4 There was no model annual reports. People
5 customized and submitted reports that look differently.
6 So, therefore, when you had peers working together,
7 they're kind of talking by each other, because everything
8 looked different. We spent enormous amounts of time going
9 through that planning phase.

10 --o0o--

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Today, most everything
12 is automated, so essentially we save time on routine
13 functions and filings of data, cut costs for complying
14 with our mandates. We have more ability to analyze the
15 data, look at trends, look at workloads. We allow the
16 focus of resources and diversion program implementation,
17 or more of that than we have in the past. And now,
18 everybody has easy, web-based access to critical decision
19 making.

20 To enhance this effort, we actually went out with
21 a survey to local jurisdictions at one point in time, to
22 find out how many of them actually had access to the web,
23 how many had computers, because we are going to try to
24 offer computers out to these jurisdictions. We found that
25 just almost all of them had some kind of access. So we

1 felt better about that. That helped us start moving
2 forward faster and faster on implementation.

3 --o0o--

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: So what kind of
5 automated systems? I'll just summarize this. It's the
6 State Agency Database, our electronic annual report,
7 SB 1066, waste characterization, disposal reporting,
8 jurisdictional waste stream profiles. It's all on there,
9 all kinds of technical assistance tools.

10 --o0o--

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Here's a screen that
12 shows you what a State agency -- this is the on-line
13 diversion rate calculator. And what this -- for our local
14 jurisdictions.

15 And the jurisdiction has a couple of options
16 here. One is, they can use our default rate that's
17 automatically calculated for them. Or they can go ahead
18 and play around with it and do their own custom diversion
19 calculation, although the result of that has to come back
20 to us for approval, if they use alternative factors.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Can I ask a question on that?

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Sure.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I hate to interrupt you. But
24 you've gone through so much information, and some of it --
25 I should have interrupted you before.

1 But on this, when you're talking about them
2 playing with the number, the default number would take
3 into consideration all the sales tax, all the employment,
4 all those types of things, and come up with a factor of
5 how much waste should have been generated, based on those
6 numbers. So it's really talking about would be like a
7 smaller jurisdiction that has an auto center in it, which
8 would generate huge amounts of sales tax but might not be
9 reflective of the real waste being generated.

10 So on a case like that, instead of taking the
11 default number, they would do the math to figure out how
12 much that piece inflated the generation number and
13 decreased the diversion number? Is that basically how
14 this works?

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Right. We'd work
16 closely with them to try to make something work.

17 You know, in California, especially in the
18 coastal communities, we have a lot of tourist -- smaller
19 jurisdictions that have a lot of tourists. You have the
20 same dynamic, because the taxable sales just don't apply
21 very well to those situations. So we work with them to
22 try to come up with --

23 MS. VAN KEKERIX: One other thing that they might
24 change is if they this a correction to the disposal
25 reporting system, they could put the numbers in, and it

1 would do the calculation for them.

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And your screens will allow
3 them do all that?

4 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Yes.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I think it's important.

6 I slowed you down, Mr. Schiavo, because I know
7 that this presentation is probably -- yours and Cara's and
8 your management staff's heart and soul, and you're going
9 through it so quickly. You're not giving yourself the
10 credit that you need, so -- because some of this stuff is
11 so incredibly important.

12 This is -- I had to do these, as a hauler with
13 the jurisdictions, and they took forever.

14 This is pretty monumental. So -- now you can go
15 on. Sorry to interrupt you.

16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: What I would like you
17 to do, because there are so many slides, is stop me at any
18 time. When you have a question, just stop and ask the
19 questions, because some of these are just more visuals,
20 and just a quick glance.

21 Others, if they're of interest, we can spend more
22 time on them. It's just hard to figure out which are
23 which.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: It's okay. I'm going back
25 after you're done.

1 --o0o--

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We can go back.

3 Anyway, on this next slide, what this shows you
4 is a screen of our State agency annual report. It's fully
5 automated. It has a look and feel that's very similar to
6 what we use for jurisdiction annual report.

7 And that was by design. We want somebody to be
8 very familiar so they can look at the data and feel very
9 comfortable with this. And we are trying to merge State
10 agency efforts with jurisdictional efforts as much as
11 possible.

12 And in the future, you know, we'll be looking at
13 large public venues. We'll be looking at the educational
14 entities and trying, again, to create more look and feel
15 for comfort levels for people.

16 Any questions?

17 --o0o--

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: In this particular
19 slide, what we show you is the before and after, if you
20 will.

21 In 1995, everybody did their annual reports by
22 paper, and we went through the biannual review process
23 pretty much through a manual system, in 2000. And then
24 you can see, ultimately, 2001, it's almost all electronic.

25 The reason for the difference in the number of

1 jurisdictions that you see up there -- you see 533 on the
2 left-hand side of the bar, versus 400 -- at about 445 on
3 the right-hand side -- is because of regionalization
4 efforts. And we've been constantly trying to promote more
5 regionalization, where it makes sense.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That it was a part of a lot
7 of compliance orders, right, was that they had said as
8 part of their compliance, they wanted to band into a
9 regional agency to better reflect what was going on?

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah. You get
11 economies of scale, you should get more accuracy with your
12 calculation of numbers, as well.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Great.

14 --o0o--

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This next slide is
16 State agencies, pretty much mirror what's been going on
17 with the local jurisdictions, as well. State agencies are
18 submitting all of their work through electronic means, as
19 well.

20 What's that's all equated to, and this is real
21 critical, is the biannual review process used to take
22 almost two and a half years, especially that first cycle.
23 And now, because of the new tools, it's about a year.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: For your staff?

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: For our staff.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: For your staff to review that
2 as it comes in.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Right.

4 For local jurisdictions staff, it should be much
5 quicker. The big -- I'm jumping ahead, but the big
6 difference is, before, when a local jurisdiction would
7 want to submit -- let's say it's a 1997 biannual review --
8 they would have to go back, look through documents, find
9 their old original source reduction recycling element,
10 compile the data from that.

11 And each year, they would have to rebuild this --
12 you know, finding that source documentation. Plus they'd
13 have to go back and look at what programs did they
14 actually implement in '95/'96, and then create the 1997
15 data, as well as hand-calculate the numbers.

16 Now, what they do is, everything is additive. So
17 at this point in time, for the next biannual, all they
18 have to do is -- everything is the same from 1995 through
19 2001. Just add in what has changed for 2002, and the
20 numbers are essentially calculated for them already,
21 unless they have to make adjustments. So they have much
22 more time available to put into program implementation,
23 unless there's some kind of severe problems with their
24 calculations.

25 And as you'll see in a little bit, that's been

1 reduced quite a bit.

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's consistent with the
3 Board's direction, that its programs and numbers are
4 indicators?

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Right.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Beautiful.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Again, there is some
8 more of that information, as we come forward.

9 --o0o--

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We did a limited survey
11 of customers, to find out what they thought of where we're
12 going with all this. And as you can see, 90 percent of
13 the people we surveyed thought the annual report was easy
14 and instructions were pretty clear. That's important to
15 us.

16 When we built the annual report, as well as the
17 State agency report, we had jurisdictions work with us and
18 test the product in the first year.

19 Second year, we did the same, but we also
20 implemented a lot of suggestions that were made by the
21 local jurisdictions, and will continue to do so, continue
22 to improve it.

23 --o0o--

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Here, is it saving you
25 time? There, you can see almost 75 percent of the people

1 say yes. There's 24 percent of the people that are
2 neutral, and two that are -- strongly disagree.

3 One thing I'd like to mention is that there's
4 probably a 25 percent turnover in local jurisdiction staff
5 each year. My guess is, a lot of those people that were
6 neutral, never had to do a paper submittal, because it was
7 pretty awful.

8 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: How about the ones that
9 disagree? Are they computer illiterate, or what do you
10 find --

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: They ride horses, or --
12 I'm not sure.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Or they don't like it at all.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Apparently.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I can't imagine. Let me
16 think.

17 Oh, no, I do remember.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR JONES: It's hard to say. I'm
19 sure they have good reasons for why they disagree.

20 What this shows is -- starts building the on-line
21 calculator and automatically calculating -- using the
22 default calculator. In 2000, we had 60 percent of the
23 people who utilized it. 77 people used alternative
24 methods, and 101 people were looking at new
25 generation-based studies.

1 In 2001, we had 70 percent of the population use
2 the on-line default calculator, and 94 people used some
3 additional alternative method.

4 So that says a lot right there. 70 percent of
5 the people are using the calculator, not doing any
6 additional calculations. That saves a lot of time.

7 --oOo--

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Here is another tool we
9 have, and this is a simplified version of it.

10 You can see the dots on the map represent our
11 permitted and active landfills. We can do the same kind
12 of graphic at each of these landfills, but we chose just
13 to go ahead and take a look at Alameda County and their
14 waste outflow to landfills. And as you can see, they have
15 some waste that -- it goes all over the place.

16 And, again, we can do this for each -- what we
17 found through the system is that we've seen Los Angeles
18 County waste go up to Redding. I mean, we've seen the
19 waste flow all over the state.

20 When the law was first developed, I think they
21 felt the waste stream was more provincial, the way they
22 set it up.

23 And what they found after we started implementing
24 the disposal reporting system, and started doing these
25 graphics, that, oh, my God, it looks quite a bit different

1 than they envisioned. So this has been very helpful.

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: These aren't restricted
3 waste, but they may be special waste; right? Where some
4 of it could be the cleanup of a gas station, where the
5 material ends up going to a facility down in Southern
6 California for disposal. And that's where that tonnage is
7 coming from, and has to be counted, because it's special
8 and not restricted?

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Right.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thanks.

11 --oOo--

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: On this next slide, we
13 look at the in-flows -- we used Sacramento County as an
14 example, that shows you -- actually Sacramento County,
15 pretty much condensed to the region.

16 But again, we can do this anywhere. And it's
17 been a real useful tool, especially when looking at
18 disposal reporting system inquiries.

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Schiavo, you've got to kind
20 of move here, that thing off to the side, and put a little
21 dot for Lockwood, Nevada.

22 (Laughter)

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: I guess you could take
24 that dot next to permit and active landfill.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And that would be Lockwood.

1 And you can color that in.

2 Go ahead.

3 --o0o--

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This shows you -- what
5 we've been trying to do is more and more technical
6 assistance on-line. What we have to do is continue to
7 improve our dissemination of the existence of it and the
8 benefits of it.

9 But if you look at that, the blue bar on the far
10 left-hand side of each month, that represents when we
11 first put it on-line in 1998.

12 And then you go, you know, to the red, to the
13 next bar over, and you can see that in June of 2000 -- or
14 1999 -- we actually put local government central on-line
15 for the first time and started putting more information up
16 there.

17 The next major milestone is, we expanded the
18 local government central in 2000, and the web hits
19 increased dramatically. The spike people, the looky-loos,
20 wanted to see what was going on initially.

21 But if you look at 2001, the hits stayed up there
22 pretty high level, which is really positive.

23 And you can see in August, when the annual report
24 was due, jurisdiction, electronic annual report used, it
25 just jumped out of the sky there, people going in and out

1 of the system. Because what they could do is, you could
2 go in, you could start on the annual report, you could
3 stop. And the information is saved there for you, so you
4 can go back and forth into it. So that's a real nice
5 feature for people out there in the local jurisdictions.

6 --o0o--

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And then finally, in
8 2002, State agency, electronic, same kind of dynamic as
9 you saw in local jurisdictions.

10 And in 2003, it's kind of interesting. We
11 haven't had any major milestones, but if you look at 2002
12 and 3, and the number of hits, it's stayed pretty -- it's
13 very high. It's constantly high. And we're looking to
14 make it higher.

15 Another one we're looking to expand greatly is
16 the tools for schools. And as you can see, in June of
17 2002, that spiked quite a bit, too, so as far as their
18 user hits.

19 And again, as I mentioned, we want to promote
20 more and more, and get those heights up there higher.

21 --o0o--

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: At this point in time,
23 this is a good opportunity for -- we have a video --
24 there's the government technology conference that's going
25 to be coming up May 14th through 16th at the Community

1 Center. And one of the things that we've worked on with
2 the public affairs, IMB and ourselves, is putting together
3 a video to showcase what we've done with the annual
4 reports and the State agency.

5 It's a 12-minute video that will cycle through
6 the entire event. But we have a six-minute version we'd
7 like to show you, just to highlight. You'll see a lot of
8 our staff in the video, and it's actually -- well, I'm
9 going to let you watch and see.

10 (Thereupon a video was played)

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Anyway, that's the
12 version for the GTC. GTC is the acronym for the
13 conference. Again, there's 12 minutes, and it will be
14 cycling over and over. I wouldn't want to be in the booth
15 hearing it over and over, but it's an excellent piece that
16 summarizes what we've been doing and how -- there's a lot
17 more interviews with people -- with users in that version.
18 But for this, we wanted to cut it down a little bit.

19 --o0o--

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Our next effort piece
21 is improving measurement accuracy. And that deals with
22 both the diversion piece as well as disposal reporting.
23 And over the last few years, that's been an extensive
24 effort, from putting together a working group to coming up
25 with fixes for disposal, and the diversion piece, and

1 doing updated calculations, to looking at new and
2 effective methods.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Schiavo.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: This is going to be -- this
6 is an area of -- there's going to be a lot of interest
7 from local government on, because this is the future. I
8 want to just take a second and see if, up to this point,
9 do any members have any questions they'd like to offer
10 right now, because we're going to get into how we may be
11 able to save local jurisdictions, give them some guidance
12 on new base years, things like that.

13 So I thought if anybody had anything, that we
14 could hear it now.

15 I have just a couple of things, if nobody else
16 does. Just two things, Pat, that I want to bring out.

17 When we looked at that Southern California -- you
18 don't have to go back to it -- when we looked at that
19 Southern California jurisdiction biannual compliance for
20 2000, between the good faith effort and the 50 percent
21 number, we were at 58 percent compliance. And in the
22 north, we were at 67. It doesn't matter. It's just more
23 jurisdictions.

24 What's really important there is that these
25 jurisdictions are somewhere that nobody else thought they

1 would be. And I think that's critically important. And I
2 think when you tie that to your discussion earlier about
3 \$10 billion of infrastructure, or of actual economic
4 development, whether it's jobs, new things in the
5 marketplace, that's obviously something that our
6 Chairwoman has to use, especially in these times, to let
7 people know that while this law may have been viewed as a
8 burden, that it has really turned out to be not only a
9 huge success, but an economic development issue. It's got
10 jobs, and it's got real investment; you know, investment
11 from local governments in my old industry. And it's
12 critical.

13 I just didn't want to go on to the next part
14 without really highlighting how important that has been
15 and what an incredible piece this is.

16 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
17 Mr. Jones.

18 I'd just like to say, when you have organizations
19 like the League of Cities and the County groups, and all
20 of that, fighting to make sure this Board stays around,
21 it's quite an accomplishment, because as I understand,
22 they weren't thrilled when it was first passed. And we've
23 done, I think, a terrific job, everyone. And we just
24 really have to get that message out, because it's not only
25 good for the environment, it's good for the economy. I

1 think this is an important message.

2 This certainly shows it. And it's nice to have
3 the video and this vehicle to send that message out,
4 Mr. Jones.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thanks, Madam Chair. I know
6 you're carrying huge amounts of water in this incredibly
7 tough environment of a budget where people have different
8 agendas they want to meet, you know. I'm not sure that
9 there's anything more important than to say how successful
10 this has been.

11 And it's been successful, I think, because of
12 local government, number one, the industry that put the
13 infrastructure in place; the Staff of the Board, and the
14 whole host of Board members that have sat in these seats,
15 have not only been regulators, but they've been advocates.
16 I think it's that advocacy and that constant work that has
17 made it understandable for jurisdictions, why this is an
18 important thing.

19 And I think your data here validates that. And
20 that's not a message that should be dismissed, especially
21 in these times.

22 You know, our legislators and our Governors are
23 looking at ways to figure out how to make government, you
24 know, smaller. And that's a smart thing to do. That's an
25 incredibly hard job in this environment.

1 So does this Board add value? Do those local
2 governments add value? Yes, they do. And this certainly
3 validates that. So while they're going to be looking at
4 ways locally to cut costs, you know, I hope that they
5 don't do something stupid as New York did.

6 I'm thinking that New York had to cut some
7 programs because they cut programs in every part of local
8 government in the city of New York, because they kept the
9 core of the things there. They just took out some items
10 that they didn't have markets for.

11 But, you know, I just think it's important that
12 we really get that message out, from the standpoint of
13 what it's done to this economy.

14 And it was one of the reasons, I think, that I
15 had asked for a listing for markets for all of the
16 products that are made with recycled content, that
17 actually sell for a lower price than virgin materials,
18 that are part of our everyday State purchasing. So that
19 we can show that the recycled product actually shows an
20 advantage to State government, and maybe ought to be the
21 only thing purchased which is going to help our market.
22 It's going to help the budgets of each one of those
23 agencies.

24 I didn't mean to interrupt your presentation, but
25 I think now when we go on to how do we save jurisdictions

1 or how do we give jurisdictions some guidance in some of
2 the things they may be looking for, that's an important,
3 important tool. But I wanted to highlight this part of --
4 before we lost it. So thanks.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: One of the things I was
6 going to bring up toward the conclusion, actually, since
7 you brought it up already, is the market's division,
8 public affairs, office of organizational effectiveness and
9 DPLA are working together to come up with strategies to
10 promote results of the studies to different groups.

11 We're looking at tailoring them to whatever
12 organization we're dealing with, because the message has
13 to be a little bit different, and the means in which you
14 get it out has to be different. So we're pursuing that.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I want to just say one more
16 thing, too, if my members don't mind.

17 The statements I'm making don't have anything to
18 do with the Board member jobs, as much as they have to do
19 with a ten-year social change that's been put the place.
20 And it's been successful.

21 And to abandon that or to minimize that, is a
22 travesty. It's a travesty to the investment that's been
23 made. So I don't want to characterize that I'm trying to
24 save my job. As much as I love what I do here, I know I
25 can feed my kids if I'm not here. Or I'm reasonably sure

1 I can. I don't know. I may have made enough people mad
2 over the last six and a half years that nobody wants to
3 touch me. But I'll worry about that.

4 But it's important that -- and I think all the
5 members agree -- we don't work that hard for any other
6 reason than to commit -- to advocate what it is that we're
7 charged with for success. So I want it in that context,
8 if the members don't mind, because I know none of us are
9 too worried about our job, as much as we are what our
10 mission is. And the mission is what's critically
11 important and takes up all of our time every day.

12 And so go ahead.

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay.

14 --o0o--

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Now that we're into
16 measurement accuracy, we'll get into saving jurisdictions
17 money with some of these slides, hopefully.

18 What you see here is that there's almost
19 40 percent of the jurisdictions have updated the base year
20 since 1995.

21 Early on in that process, there's some
22 jurisdictions that had some accuracy issues. So what we
23 did is, we began a process by -- through Board direction,
24 of coming up with a more detailed certification form as
25 well as a verification process.

1 And what we feel as a result of that is, we have
2 a lot more accurate reflection of what's being depicted
3 with the local jurisdictions' performance.

4 --o0o--

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: In this next table,
6 what you see is when those base years took place. As you
7 can see, the bulk of them were 1998, '99 and 2000. We
8 expect that the year 2001 will increase significantly,
9 because we're always a couple of years in arrears in how
10 we look at this. So we'll see that jump up like the
11 others have.

12 --o0o--

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: What does a typical
14 jurisdiction's waste stream look like? We just took an
15 example of a particular jurisdiction. And what we found
16 is that about 25 percent of this jurisdiction was
17 residential waste. 37 percent was partially residential,
18 but ADC and landfill salvage. And then, most importantly,
19 there is about -- almost 40 percent were related to
20 commercial businesses.

21 When the jurisdiction is performing a new base
22 year study, by far the most cost goes into that 38 percent
23 area of that commercial businesses. That's where the cost
24 is born.

25 After submittal, the 174 jurisdictions, what I

1 want to do is start taking a look at what went on in these
2 studies. It was really interesting.

3 We took a case study -- we just picked out this
4 one jurisdiction. Within the jurisdiction, there's about
5 7600 businesses. Because of that number of businesses,
6 this jurisdiction decided to extrapolate out to determine
7 what their calculation would be. So they actually did a
8 sampling of 333 businesses. The results were to be
9 extrapolated out to the remaining -- the 7600.

10 --o0o--

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We decided to take a
12 look at what the impacts of looking at the top ten
13 business generators would have on this jurisdiction. We
14 found that the top ten businesses represented 50 percent
15 of their diversion efforts.

16 That represents -- you know, that top ten
17 represented 50 percent of that 7600. If you take it over
18 to the far right-hand side, the top 30, that's 80 percent
19 of that 7600 businesses. And my guess is that if you
20 drilled down to the top 50, you'd probably get 90 percent
21 plus. But that's huge, when you're looking at spending a
22 lot of money and doing a new study.

23 So our suggestion is that, you know, they
24 reevaluate how they look at these studies.

25 --o0o--

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: But what we did, is
2 after doing that exercise, we looked at 35 other studies
3 we decided to take a look at, just because of time,
4 recourse, availability.

5 We looked at the top ten in each of these 35
6 jurisdictions. We found out that 33 of the 35 derive
7 50 percent or more of their diversion from those top ten
8 businesses. 21 of the 35 derived 80 percent or more out
9 of the top ten. And 13 of the 35 derived over 90 percent
10 diversion from the top ten businesses.

11 And again, that's only looking at ten businesses.
12 If we went down to 20, 30, 40, those results would look
13 quite a bit different.

14 So based on this cross section, you know, again,
15 it looks like you can save a lot of money. The accuracy
16 probably wouldn't vary. You can get a better idea of
17 what's going on in the jurisdiction.

18 --o0o--

19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Our observations
20 overall regarding the base year efforts is, the quality of
21 the studies have been improving over time since we
22 implemented the new certification and verification
23 process.

24 We still have, you know -- we still get into
25 issues from time to time, but overall it has been

1 improving quite a bit.

2 Improve the quality of the data by tying programs
3 to diversion. That's been very important in the past.
4 That wasn't done. So you looked at things in the
5 aggregate. So you find out, gee, based on our study,
6 you'd be at 50 percent. But you didn't know what programs
7 comprise that 50 percent.

8 And doing it the way they're doing now, that's a
9 relationship, and that's critical.

10 We're providing the jurisdictions with
11 information on the potential gaps in program efforts. And
12 what that does, again, is it's a real useful tool in
13 program planning.

14 So we hear the story of a jurisdiction who has to
15 make an outlie of 30- or \$50,000 -- I'm just using an
16 example. Some are higher. Some are lower -- to do a new
17 base year study. But what it is is an excellent planning
18 tool to look at where you can effectively put your
19 diversion resources.

20 So if you are spending an excess amount of money
21 in a program area, and you're not getting much return, you
22 can make adjustments. And you can get back that 50,000 in
23 no time, through those adjustments.

24 --o0o--

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: The other part of the

1 process is looking at disposal reporting and improving
2 those efforts. And a couple of years ago, SB 2202 was
3 passed and signed by the Governor that had us work with
4 groups of local interested parties. We literally sent out
5 results and tried to get feedback from thousands of people
6 out in the field that could be potentially impacted.

7 We had working groups, went through a lot of
8 effort to try to get -- as well as improve the system.

9 Essentially what we found is, summarizing,
10 there's potential of error in all components of the
11 diversion rate measurement system. That's why we call it
12 an indicator, and the second bullet.

13 Diversion rates are estimates, indicators. Small
14 jurisdictions are more likely to have inaccurate diversion
15 rate, especially because of disposal reporting. And we
16 need to focus on diversion program implementation;
17 although, again, it has to be coupled with numbers as an
18 indicator. You can't do one without the other. They go
19 hand in hand.

20 --oOo--

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: In this table, looking
22 at the line chart at the very top, where it says 1.13 and
23 then goes down to 1.08, what that represents is the level
24 of variance in disposal reporting over the last four
25 years.

1 And the lower the number, the better. And what's
2 really interesting about that is, if you look at the
3 largest jurisdictions, which are on the right-hand side of
4 that table, the larger jurisdictions seem to have less
5 variance than the smaller ones. As you go from right to
6 left, you see a lot more variability with the smaller
7 jurisdictions.

8 The next thing we did is, after looking at that,
9 we wanted to find out what would happen if each of the
10 counties in California regionalized. That was pretty
11 interesting.

12 --o0o--

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: You see the line chart
14 drops down quite a bit. It now starts at 1.10 and goes
15 down to 1.05. But you don't see a whole lot of
16 jurisdictions or counties with variability until you get
17 to the rural ones. And again, even some of the rural
18 counties, they're so small, they're only 25,000.

19 They're going to be impacted by allocations and
20 other issues with disposal reporting. There's no way of
21 getting around it.

22 But anyway, this was an interesting exercise that
23 showed the impacts of aggregating that data from the
24 jurisdictions to the County level.

25 --o0o--

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Again, the
2 regionalization, we're continuing to try to promote
3 regionalization where it makes sense. And, you know,
4 we've gotten about 100 jurisdictions to regionalize.
5 Hopefully we've have more success in the future, again,
6 where it makes sense.

7 --o0o--

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Activities to improve
9 the disposal reporting accuracy, we're looking at revising
10 the regulations. We've been working with interested
11 parties and going out in the workshop, going through the
12 workshop process, bit by bit.

13 And so we're going through our draft process.
14 You'll be seeing, you know, results of that in the near
15 future, looking at, you know, the frequency the amount of
16 training, potential enforcement issues. We're looking at
17 creating web-based training modules so people can have --
18 readily access that information.

19 We're looking at continuing our random facility
20 site visits. That's been very helpful, and then
21 publishing results of those the our Intracycling
22 newsletter that goes out to all the jurisdictions and
23 interested parties.

24 --o0o--

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Here you see the

1 results of those unannounced site visits which commenced
2 in 2000. We broke it out by regions. As you can see, we
3 had about a 60 percent compliance level in 2000.

4 In 2001 --

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Excuse me. That 60 percent,
6 is -- this was when you guys were bringing loads across a
7 scale somewhere, where they didn't know you were from the
8 Waste Board. You were seeing -- you were verifying if
9 they asked the right questions, asked where the waste was
10 coming from, so your compliance is of your own undercover
11 investigation?

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Right.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I just wanted to make sure.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Each quarter, we send
15 staff out to perform this activity.

16 And as you can see, when we got to 2002, we've
17 seen a lot of increase in all regions.

18 Overall, the operators have been very
19 cooperative. They have worked with us real well. We
20 don't have any issue there.

21 They have been providing additional training to
22 the gatehouse staff. They have been trying to ask the
23 right questions. That's been very positive.

24 Some of them, as a result of what they saw for
25 2000, have changed over to daily reporting to try to

1 resolve some of their issues. So this has worked out very
2 well.

3 This has been one of those tangible activities.
4 You really see progress.

5 --o0o--

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We're trying to look
7 into the future and where we need to go, and what's going
8 to guide us in getting there.

9 Obviously, we need to implement the statutes and
10 strategic plan. We're looking at continuing to save our
11 customers time and money. That's really critical. We
12 want to improve our delivery system. We've improved quite
13 a bit, but there's still a ways to go. We're at a lot of
14 different activities there. We're looking at leverage in
15 our tools and technology to create staff time so that we
16 can provide more technical assistance and hands-on
17 assistance to local jurisdictions and other customers.

18 And we're still looking at where do we need to
19 focus, where are the major components of the waste stream,
20 because that's critical, because that's what we're trying
21 to is divert materials.

22 --o0o--

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Based on our
24 characterization efforts in 1990 and 1999, what we found
25 is that paper and other organic materials are still the

1 major components of the waste stream.

2 You know, we're real proud of this
3 characterization effort, and the staff has done a terrific
4 job, because when you look at the dynamic of California,
5 and the geography, the weather conditions, the population
6 bases, it's a real challenge here to try to perform this
7 activity.

8 And like I said, they've been terrific. This
9 information is really helpful for trying to focus in on
10 where we need to go to continue to divert materials.

11 This particular year, we're commencing a new
12 study, we're going to add some category types, some
13 E-waste categories, some used oil categories, to look at
14 those elements, as well, and update where we are as far as
15 some of these material types. And hopefully that will
16 guide some of our program efforts in the future.

17 So, you know, these tables are very important to
18 us.

19 --o0o--

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: In the future, one of
21 the things we're looking at, trying to continue to
22 streamline our biannual review processes for this upcoming
23 cycle. What we're thinking about in that particular area
24 is continue to agendize. What we'd like to do is a
25 streamlined agenda for those jurisdictions that are above

1 50 or continued to be above 50, and those who have been
2 considered good faith efforts.

3 But that doesn't change how we're going to go out
4 and verify the information. We'll still do our site
5 visits. We'll still be in contact. We just won't go
6 through the extensive agenda process that we did in the
7 past.

8 At this point the time, you know, if all those
9 260 were still coming forward, above 50 and good faith
10 effort, that would reduce quite a bit of the workload.

11 But knowing the way this works, you know, it will
12 be some other number, but it will still be high.

13 And hopefully everybody got our message that you
14 must be above 50 for 2000 and beyond, because we're trying
15 to get that word, people thinking we can get to 50 percent
16 by 2000 and be -- stop. That's not the case. You must
17 maintain 50 percent

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's important. SB 2202
19 said that all of the -- I'm paraphrasing, obviously -- but
20 all of the requirements and the remedies are still intact.
21 Which means, every two years, if they're not at 50, we go
22 under compliance, and at some point, fines.

23 So I think that's critical, that you develop --
24 and I know you are -- the indicators that show you if
25 somebody's number starts to fall a little bit, but they're

1 dropping major programs that were components, we need to
2 figure out a system to make sure that they've analyzed
3 that waste stream enough to know they can drop those and
4 continue to maintain good programs for their cities and
5 counties. So -- and I know you will.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Waste analysis branch
7 has been continually working in that area, and
8 coordination with the Office of Local Assistance. We try
9 to look again at the program components and numbers.

10 Though I continue to improve and streamline the
11 diversion program and new base year verification process,
12 we will want to automate that more, want to make it
13 interactive like the annual report process is. And also,
14 we want to automate the verification process as much as
15 possible, and we're working to do that. It just takes
16 time.

17 So that's regarding the process side of what
18 we're doing.

19 What we'd like to do, if we can free up some
20 staff from the agenda process, is work with those
21 jurisdictions most in need, try to get them up, and focus
22 our efforts on that.

23 We also want to work with State agencies closer,
24 because, again, you know, we need to lead by example. And
25 so we want to continue to do that and enhance our ability

1 to do that.

2 You heard the presentation with Chris Schmidle.

3 A lot of large public venues are also State agencies, and
4 so he's been coordinating, as well, with the State agency
5 staff.

6 We want to encourage recycling activities and new
7 technologies in all businesses and residences. We want to
8 provide tools that the entire organization can use not
9 just -- this isn't just a DPLA thing; this is something
10 that can apply to all parts of our organization.

11 We want to be able to target certain sectors of
12 the waste stream, depending on what they're producing as
13 far as -- or generating as far as our waste streams.

14 We want to continue our -- actually, we'd like to
15 expand our public venue efforts. You know, Chris and
16 Debra Kustic made really good process in getting that
17 started.

18 You mentioned getting out there and getting the
19 word out. That's a huge step, and we need to have the
20 resources to free up. And that's where we want to put
21 some of that effort, is -- actually Chris has been
22 compiling association names that have any kind of
23 relationship, that deal with large public venues. And we
24 have been talking about a way of doing that. But again,
25 only so much you can do at a given time.

1 --o0o--

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Want to improve the
3 exchange of and access of information internally and
4 externally. Again, in this day and age, we're trying to
5 conserve resources, and jurisdictions are, as well.

6 We want to get as much in the way of tools out
7 there that people can use on our web site. And -- but
8 what we have to do to make that work is, they have to
9 understand what's there, how to use it, and how much it
10 can actually help them. So we're continually working in
11 that area.

12 We need, through consistent effective
13 enforcement, or other program measures, ensure compliance
14 with our laws and regulations. So that's going to
15 continue. That will not diminish at all.

16 --o0o--

17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: That pretty much
18 completes the presentation.

19 But while it completes this part of my
20 presentation, it really -- this begins our process for
21 trying to get out, doing more hands-on efforts.

22 Over the last couple of years, I think we've
23 collectively gotten a lot smarter, jurisdictions,
24 ourselves. And we can use all that to actually do a lot
25 more. It shouldn't be the end, as we get to 50 percent.

1 It's really, in a sense, the beginning of where we need to
2 go for the next step so --

3 More questions?

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got two speakers.

5 Any questions from the members? Okay.

6 I've got Mr. Jim Hemminger.

7 MR. HEMMINGER: Thank you. Jim Hemminger from
8 the Rural Counties Environmental Services, JPA.

9 We're actually going to give a more formal
10 presentation with some more details and correspondence at
11 the Board meeting next week, looking at AB 939 and the
12 rural counties.

13 But I was hoping, if you would indulge me a few
14 minutes. I won't be around next week, able to make the
15 presentation. I was hoping to share a few personal
16 observations.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Certainly.

18 MR. HEMMINGER: As you know, the JPA represents
19 the 20 smallest counties in the state. Demographically,
20 we have the lowest population density. Geographically,
21 we're farthest from the markets. Economically,
22 financially, a lot of local governments and personal
23 income is some of the lowest in the state. And
24 politically, perhaps compared to some of our more urban
25 counterparts, don't embrace State mandates perhaps as

1 eagerly as others.

2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Nice way to put
3 it.

4 MR. HEMMINGER: AB 939 has been a challenge. And
5 Pat didn't have a slide for it, but if we did do some
6 calculations, and were showing the jurisdictions that had
7 the most improvement since 1999, frankly, the rural
8 jurisdictions would be off the chart.

9 We started out, most of our jurisdictions in 1990
10 base years, were three to five percent diversion. And at
11 this point, now, all our counties, the 20 counties, have
12 gone through the process, one major accomplishment without
13 a compliance order, some with time extensions, some with
14 good faith efforts, some with petitions for reduction; but
15 have all moved forward within the process, successfully.

16 A lot of that -- we certainly appreciate your
17 guidance from the Board staff and the policy direction
18 from Pat and Cara and Mr. Elliot. But it's the people on
19 the front line that I did actually want to acknowledge
20 today, specifically a lot of folks.

21 But we work in the rural counties. I'm not sure
22 if they pick the short straw or not. We work a lot with
23 Jill Simmons, Natalie Lee, Kyle Pogue, and Cedar Kehoe.
24 They're the ones going out to the County. And our
25 jurisdiction presented a challenge to all of them.

1 And I cannot actually find the words to really
2 explain the level of effort they put forward on this
3 program. To say it was above and beyond the call of duty
4 is an understatement. They adopted our counties and
5 worked with them. Sometimes it was contentious. Many
6 times it was frustrating. And it would have been easy,
7 especially for some of our counties very early on, to say
8 "compliance order." We weren't quite up to snuff in some
9 areas.

10 But the Staff didn't do that, and it would have
11 been the easy way out; but instead, worked with the
12 counties to try to get the programs, get a 1066 work
13 schedule together.

14 On the other hand, it would have been easy for
15 the Staff, too, given all the challenges we have in the
16 rural, a little bit of our rural aw, shucks; we could have
17 said, well, good faith efforts, let's let them go by.
18 Small percent of the state.

19 But on the one hand, they didn't give the
20 compliance order punitively. But on the other hand, they
21 weren't willing to just give a good faith effort, if you
22 will, let us off the hook. So I did want to take this
23 time to give particular attention to those folks.

24 When I was with the County, we used to smirk
25 sometimes when people would talk, folks from local

1 assistance. We had our own jokes about the terms. But
2 throughout this program, especially the staff people, they
3 were wonderful.

4 As a personal observation -- but I wouldn't come
5 up here, given the politics of our rural counties, on my
6 own. We had a Board meeting last month, and I wanted to
7 be sure that our memberships wanted to acknowledge the
8 efforts of the Waste Board in this regard. And probably
9 more than my opinions, I had unanimous support from all
10 the rural counties to say thank you, to the Waste Board
11 staff.

12 We'll still have issues, and we'll have some
13 suggestions for the future. But, again, the level of
14 effort was very much appreciated and positively reflected
15 of the Waste Board. So thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thanks, Jim. We appreciate
17 that. And we appreciate the effort --

18 (Applause)

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Evan Edgar.

20 MR. EDGAR: Evan Edgar, California Refuse Removal
21 Council.

22 I was here five years ago on a previous DPLA
23 committee, talking about AB 939 enforcement. At the time
24 we were concerned about the word, "good faith effort," and
25 a lot of people throughout the state were skeptical and

1 nervous. And then SB 1066 came along, time extensions,
2 ADRs, and we had further unknowns. Throughout the state,
3 in 1998, we didn't know what the future would hold.

4 But today, we of the Waste Board's leadership,
5 there is a -- gone beyond good faith efforts, staff has,
6 and Waste Board members, that's how SB 1066 works, and yet
7 protect our investments in AB 939.

8 In the year 2000, over 24 million people in
9 California had curbside recycling services. 24 million.
10 That's a big number, about 70 percent.

11 CRC provided a lot of those services. That's
12 over two-thirds of a billion dollars investment in AB 939
13 since 1999.

14 CRC has over 140 collection programs at the curb,
15 over 50 *murfs, and 40 of those have permitted a C&D
16 program, and we have a dozen compost facilities. So we've
17 made that investment in 939, starting in 1990.

18 So when 1998 came around, we are very concerned
19 about protecting our investment. We were very concerned
20 about how the promise of AB 939 wouldn't be kept. We were
21 worried about the waste generation studies.

22 I testified in a couple workshops about the
23 Eugene King model and waste generation and inflation. I
24 was really, really concerned about the fact that these
25 numbers could have gone around our facilities. We could

1 have got compliance by a calculator. We could have had
2 more Enron accounting, could have devalued AB 939 assets.
3 We built the facilities, and we wanted people to come.

4 Well, as you've seen, we've seen the 1066 plans
5 are pushing more materials through our facilities. We are
6 creating opportunities, and we're validating the programs.
7 We have flexibility. Down south, some of our major
8 players were concerned about good faith efforts and time
9 extension. They're worried about how it could be
10 implemented, would it be fair and flexible.

11 And it has been. That was a big concern we had.
12 So over the last five years, we've seen it play out in the
13 reality, and the AB 939 is a success.

14 So we thank the Waste Board staff and leadership,
15 because we have process and achievement. We have
16 continued to invest in 939. The future is bright. It
17 doesn't end; it's just the beginning. And we are
18 investing more in 939, more in composting, more in C&D
19 facilities, and we see a future with zero waste.

20 So on behalf of CRC, we thank you and Staff to
21 have a great protection in our investment. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

23 All right. Any questions of members?

24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I just wanted to
25 have the opportunity to thank you for putting together

1 this report, and all the years of work it's taken.

2 And did you determine, Mr. Jones, that the full
3 Board would be hearing this?

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Actually, I think that was
5 your determination. Or I'm going to -- I think it does
6 belong there, and I think that you'd agree, and --

7 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Most definitely.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I think it's important that
9 the whole Board hear this and we continue to talk about
10 this.

11 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Thank you for all the hard
12 work you've done. It's incredible good work. Saves time
13 and resources. Saves the trees.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And again, it's the
15 staff. They do all the work. We just kind of sit up
16 here --

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Take all the credit.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: -- take all the credit.
19 They worked really hard and put all this together.

20 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Taken a few
21 arrows along the way.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's what I was going to
23 say. Ms. Peace doesn't know, but there was a time when
24 these guys had to come with full flak jackets. I was the
25 thrower of some of those arrows, continually. Trying to

1 do it fairly, though.

2 But thank you very much. Thank you to all your
3 staff, and those that aren't here today. We've gone
4 through some tough times. But I want to tell you, when we
5 did the -- what the heck do we call it when we stopped
6 taking the base years --

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Moratorium.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: You guys were getting
9 screamed at. You were getting yelled at. Everybody was
10 upset. The members were getting upset at *Eaton and I
11 because we were taking too long; and they took heat.

12 But they stuck with us, and it made for a better
13 product. And you know, sometimes you got to take those
14 shots. We certainly did, as members.

15 But we have a valid, honest program. And you
16 should all take a lot of credit for that. And we
17 appreciate you tolerating Board members.

18 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Sounds like you've gone from
19 getting bullets to getting love letters. That's really
20 incredible, that you can turn it around like that.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: It is. Okay.

22 Any members of the public.

23 This is the last meeting of DPLA. As I said
24 earlier, the new Committee will be Ms. Peace,
25 Mr. Washington, and myself.

1 I want to thank Madam Chair and Mr. Medina for
2 all the work. You guys were great.

3 I sent a memo to the members. I know I should
4 change these committees, because I had asked her to run
5 this -- run DPLA for me at the next Committee meeting
6 because I'm not going to be around.

7 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: That's right.
8 What timing.

9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Because I won't be around
10 during that Committee week.

11 But I did ask Mr. Washington, and he agreed,
12 because we both sit on markets. And you know, I didn't
13 know what it was going to be. And his office was right
14 next to mine, so I asked him if he'd do it. I'm sure
15 Ms. Peace would have done it, too.

16 But Mr. Peace -- I'm sorry -- Ms. Peace and
17 Mr. Washington will be here at our first new Committee
18 meeting, and I won't.

19 Thank you all.

20 This thing is adjourned.

21 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
22 Management Board, Diversion, Planning and Local
23 Assistance Committee adjourned at 10:52 p.m.)

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, TIFFANY C. KRAFT, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me,
7 Tiffany C. Kraft, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any
12 way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14 this 19th day of May, 2003.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR
23 Certified Shorthand Reporter
24 License No. 12277
25